



POLICE DEPARTMENT

March 11, 2010

MEMORANDUM FOR: Police Commissioner

Re: Sergeant Thomas Lent  
Tax Registry No. 919291  
73 Precinct  
Disciplinary Case Nos. 83041/07 & 85211/09

---

The above-named member of the Department appeared before the Court on January 4 and 5, 2010, charged with the following:

Disciplinary Case No. 83041/07

1. Said Sergeant Thomas Lent, assigned to the 73rd Precinct, while on-duty on or about January 6, 2006, at approximately 2330 hours in the vicinity of [REDACTED] Street, Kings County, NY, did wrongfully and without just cause fail to supervise other members of the service under his supervision to wit: after stopping and questioning two individuals, identities known to the Department, for alleged narcotics possession, said Sergeant allowed said individuals to be released without first directing and ensuring that a UF-250 report was completed, as required.

P.G. 202-17, Page 1, Paragraph 1 – PATROL SUPERVISOR/  
DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

2. Said Sergeant Thomas Lent, assigned as indicated in specification #1, while on-duty on or about January 7, 2006, at approximately 2330 hours in the vicinity of [REDACTED] Street, Kings County, NY, Said Sergeant failed to notify Central that he and members of his Anti-Crime Unit conducted several vertical patrols in the vicinity of [REDACTED] Street and Howard Avenue.

P.G. 212-59, Page 1, Paragraph 5 – COMMAND OPERATIONS/VERTICAL PATROL

3. Said Sergeant Thomas Lent, assigned as indicated in Specification #1, on or about the date, time and location as indicated in specification #2, after conducting several vertical patrols in the vicinity of [REDACTED] Street and Howard Avenue, failed to make Activity Log (PD112-145) entries regarding the results of said vertical patrols.

P.G. 212-59, Page 1, Paragraph 11 – COMMAND OPERATIONS VERTICAL PATROL

4. Said Sergeant Thomas Lent, assigned as indicated in Specification #1, on or about the date indicated in specification #2, did fail and neglect to register a confidential informant, identity known to the Department, prior to utilizing said individual.

INTERIM ORDER #23, Page 2, Paragraph 3 – REVISION TO PG #212-68  
CONFIDENTIAL INFORMANTS

Disciplinary Case No. 85211/09

1. Said Sergeant Thomas Lent, assigned to the 73rd Precinct, while on-duty, on or about and between November 8, 2007 and November 10, 2007, did engage in conduct prejudicial to the good order, efficiency or discipline of the Department, in that said Sergeant failed to insure that a subordinate properly vouchered prisoner property from an arrest in a timely manner.

P.G. 203-10, Page 1, Paragraph 5 – GENERAL REGULATIONS

The Department was represented by Rita Bieniewicz, Esq., Department Advocate's Office, and the Respondent was represented by Andrew Quinn, Esq.

The Respondent, through his counsel, entered a plea of Not Guilty to the subject charges. A stenographic transcript of the trial record has been prepared and is available for the Police Commissioner's review.

DECISION

In Case No. 83041/07, the Respondent is found Guilty of Specification No. 1 and Not Guilty of Specification Nos. 2-4. In Case No. 85211/09, the Respondent is found Not Guilty.

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE PRESENTEDThe Department's Case

The Department called Detective Mario Corletto, Sergeant Joseph Rodriguez, and Sergeant Michael King as witnesses.

Detective Mario Corletto

Corletto was assigned to the Internal Affairs Bureau (IAB) and had been a member of the Department for fifteen years. When he was a police officer, Corletto was assigned to patrol in Police Service Area (PSA) 3 and the School Safety Division.

Corletto investigated an allegation of [REDACTED] concerning an incident on January 6, 2006. The complaint was called into IAB by [REDACTED]' mother, who said that she received calls from an officer named Tommy. Tommy said that [REDACTED] was going to get arrested, or that he was "looking for" [REDACTED]

Corletto interviewed [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], his girlfriend. [REDACTED] was 16 years old at the time and [REDACTED] was 13 years old. [REDACTED] stated that he was in a cab that was pulled over by plainclothes officers. He alleged that he was in possession of heroin, marijuana, and a scale, and that in exchange for his information about the guns, the officers had taken these items without charging him. [REDACTED] said that the information about guns was that he mentioned the name [REDACTED], who lived down the block from [REDACTED]s on [REDACTED] Street (Brooklyn) and had two guns in his apartment. [REDACTED] alleged that he was detained for two hours. He referred to the person he talked to as "Vader," which Corletto determined meant the Respondent, who had been wearing a Star Wars shirt.

Corletto went to the 73 Precinct's crime analysis unit to look for UF-250s (Stop, Question and Frisk Report Worksheets or "250s") for [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], but could not find any. Corletto testified that the crime analysis unit keeps a computer log of the 250s. No paperwork was found that would document the filling out of the 250s.

Official Department interviews were conducted of five subjects: the Respondent, Sergeant Swystun, and Police Officers Kirk Anderson, Rodriguez, and Dobles. All five officers stated that they believed the UF-250s were filled out, but none of the officers "personally claim[ed] that they filled one out." The Respondent stated that "it should have been filled out."

Corletto also learned information concerning January 7, 2006. [REDACTED] told him that "there were some calls made, some communications conducted between" him and the Respondent.<sup>1</sup> [REDACTED] told Corletto that the Respondent left messages saying he needed to get in touch with [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] provided a phone number to Corletto, and when Corletto called it, the voice mail "came back his name Tommy." Corletto ordered the phone records for this number, which the phone company stated was registered to the Respondent. Corletto prepared a worksheet of the calls between [REDACTED] and the Respondent (DX 1). There were 14 calls from the Respondent to [REDACTED] and 3 to [REDACTED]'s home. There were 4 calls from [REDACTED] to the Respondent.

Corletto testified that he learned from the Intelligence Division that [REDACTED] was not registered as a confidential informant (CI).

The Advocate asked Corletto about "vertical patrols that might have occurred on January 7, 2006 involving the Respondent." Corletto testified that there were "no records of vertical patrols made to central."

---

<sup>1</sup> On direct examination, Corletto indicated that [REDACTED] told him the Respondent had called his residence. On cross-examination, Corletto testified that [REDACTED] received these calls on his cell phone [REDACTED] cell number as listed on Department's Exhibit [DX] 1 is a [REDACTED] area code).

The Respondent told Corletto that [REDACTED] called him earlier and said there was a black male walking up and down the block that had a gun in a waist pack. Corletto could not confirm this information with [REDACTED] because by the time of the Respondent's interview, [REDACTED] could not be located. Corletto did not determine that the officers believed this male to be [REDACTED].

All five officers interviewed told Corletto that when they arrived on [REDACTED] Street, they were hit with "airmail," i.e., rocks or bottles being thrown from buildings. The Respondent sent his team "to conduct verticals" on that block of [REDACTED] Street. The Respondent and possibly the others used the specific term "vertical patrol."

Corletto testified that Anderson told him in his official Department interview that while conducting the vertical patrol in [REDACTED] Street, a male, [REDACTED], exited an apartment. Anderson smelled marijuana emanating from the apartment and stopped [REDACTED]. A second male, [REDACTED], opened the door.

Anderson and [REDACTED] both told Corletto that [REDACTED] invited Anderson in, although [REDACTED] did not mention the marijuana odor. [REDACTED] identified himself, and Anderson asked him "if he had anything." [REDACTED] said he had two guns in a safe, but he was holding them for someone else. [REDACTED] was arrested and Anderson was the arresting officer.

Corletto testified that [REDACTED] stated in his interview that the officers announced that [REDACTED] had said "there were guns in the apartment," and that if [REDACTED] did not reveal the location of the guns, the officers would arrest and "take away" [REDACTED]'s family, and arrest [REDACTED] as well. Anderson denied that this occurred. Corletto also testified that based on the [REDACTED] interview "and based on my worksheet," before the officers entered [REDACTED]'s apartment, the police were trying to gain entry into the apartment through a rear window. None of the officers corroborated this.

On cross-examination, Corletto admitted that the cab driver told him that [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] had exited the car. The driver also contradicted [REDACTED]' claim that he was in possession of heroin, marijuana and a scale. [REDACTED] also alleged that [REDACTED] possessed these items, but could not say where he obtained them.

Corletto testified that UF-250s are supposed to be signed by a supervisor and dropped in a box or basket at the precinct desk. All of the Respondent's subordinates told Corletto that the Respondent was "pretty rigid" about ensuring that 250s were done. Corletto noted that a 250 was prepared for the stop of [REDACTED], the next day, and that Anderson noted this in his memo book.

Corletto did not check to see if there were any problems in the 73 Precinct's system of logging the 250s. He did not look through any paper stack of 250s, but he did not know if the 73 Precinct kept hard copies of them. None of the officers wrote in their memo books that a 250 was prepared.

Corletto conceded that CI registration was not required in every instance where a civilian tells an officer about criminal activity, and the officer "ultimately uses that information in some form or fashion and makes an arrest." Corletto agreed that CI registration is not required if someone calls the police and says there is a person on the street in possession of a gun, even if the person "is identified, meaning you know who he is by name, first and last." Corletto asserted in this instance that "specific information" was given. He contended that [REDACTED] information resulted in the arrest of [REDACTED]. Corletto did not ask the officers if they ran the name "[REDACTED]" in any database. Corletto stated that to the best of his recollection, [REDACTED] did not specify the [REDACTED] address or describe [REDACTED]

Corletto agreed that he was unable to determine how many of the 21 phone calls resulted in conversation. Nor could [REDACTED] state how many resulted in conversation. Corletto agreed that the Respondent did not ask [REDACTED] for more specific information. Corletto testified that [REDACTED] remembered receiving one call from a male that was looking for [REDACTED]. The male said "they will make their lives miserable if they did not come up with guns." In the official Department interviews, no officer acknowledged making that statement.

Corletto stated that a vertical patrol meant that "you put it over the air to central and let them know you are doing a vertical of a building or a particular address." His understanding of the term was when more than one officer enters a building, "uniformly" going "floor to floor, step by step, to determine if any crime is occurring anywhere in that building." The patrols are "generally" performed "over a course of a large area" in New York City Housing Authority (NYCHA) residential buildings.

Corletto testified that all five officers said they entered one building, but did not indicate the "speed or manner" in which they did so. He then said that he believed two of the officers stayed outside to secure the RMP. None of the Respondent's team stated that the Respondent instructed them to conduct vertical patrols. No one on the team told Corletto that they performed a "uniformed floor by floor sweep of any buildings on [REDACTED] Street."

Corletto did not recall whether the officers told him that they searched one or multiple buildings on [REDACTED] Street. He agreed that the transcript of Rodriguez's official Department interview read that the Respondent told Rodriguez that he "wanted to pay particular attention to the area of [REDACTED]," and that they conducted vertical patrols of several buildings, including [REDACTED].

Corletto agreed that the officers knew to ask [REDACTED], “do you have anything you shouldn’t have,” because “they just learned that the day before from [REDACTED].”

Corletto testified that [REDACTED] made a Mirandized written statement after his arrest in which he said that the police asked if he had “anything in here [he] shouldn’t have,” and he answered that he had two guns in a safe but they belonged to someone else (see Respondent’s Exhibit A, [REDACTED] statement).

Corletto agreed that [REDACTED]’s arrest did not occur because the Respondent’s anti-crime team went “directly to that apartment” to search for those weapons. Based on the officers’ interviews, they entered the building “to conduct verticals” as a result of the airmail. Corletto did not learn of any information that contradicted the officers’ statements.

On re-direct examination, Corletto testified that the Respondent never said in his interview that there may have been a problem at the 73 Precinct regarding 250s getting lost.

On examination by the Court, Corletto stated that if “specific information” is given by an individual during a stop to an anti-crime unit, the individual must be registered as a CI regardless of whether the information is followed up.

Corletto claimed, “Any time you go into a building, it’s considered a vertical.” He conceded, for example, if an officer is on patrol and someone comes out of a building and reports an assault in progress, and the officer and her partner enter the building, that is not a vertical patrol. He clarified that the difference is that in the Respondent’s case, they were searching for the origin of the airmail, and “you need to conduct a vertical patrol” to do so.

Corletto said that in the assault example, if the officer knocked on every door listening for signs of a fight, that would be considered a vertical. If the officer knew the exact apartment of the assault, “You can make it a vertical patrol, but it’s not really a vertical patrol because you

are specifically going to an apartment." Once the officer enters the building, "if you are checking the floor," the officer can radio central and state "I am conducting a vertical in the building . . . . So while you are investigating that, you can also attach a vertical to it." The officer does not "have to specifically say I am going to do a vertical," but "you can get credit for a vertical . . . in your area or specific patrol area."

On re-cross examination, Corletto stated that CI registration is required only when the officer has determined the specific information to be reliable, and that the officer is "going to base your arrest solely on that information."

Sergeant Joseph Rodriguez

On January 6 and 7, 2006, Rodriguez was a police officer in the 73 Precinct anti-crime unit. His tour on January 6, 2006, was 1730x0205, but it was extended by four hours. The Respondent was his supervisor. He was also working with Anderson, Swystun and Dobles. They were in plainclothes in an unmarked vehicle.

Rodriguez testified that on the night of January 6, 2006, he stopped two individuals, [REDACTED]. He had observed a cab pulled to the side of the road with two individuals standing on the side of the vehicle. Rodriguez saw [REDACTED] lighting what appeared to be a marijuana cigarette. When [REDACTED] observed Rodriguez, he threw the joint to the ground. Rodriguez smelled marijuana but could not find the joint.

Rodriguez asked [REDACTED] what he threw, and [REDACTED] said "nothing, you are just wasting your time." Rodriguez then "bluffed" and said, "oh, I have it." [REDACTED] then said, "oh, officer, you are not going to arrest me for that little crap. I know you are out here for bigger things. . . . You guys are like the anti-crime unit. You are out here for guns and stuff like that."

[REDACTED] "volunteered" information about a location in, Rodriguez believed, [REDACTED], where he bought drugs. Sparks also "blurted out" some other information about local drug dealing. [REDACTED] also mentioned the name [REDACTED], whom he described as a Hispanic male living at [REDACTED], and said he was a drug dealer and possibly possessed weapons. [REDACTED] did not say how many guns he thought [REDACTED] possessed. [REDACTED] did not tell Rodriguez he wanted anything in exchange for his information.

Rodriguez testified that the stop of [REDACTED] took place approximately two blocks from [REDACTED].

Rodriguez testified that the Respondent arrived on the scene. [REDACTED] repeated the same information "that he was blurting" out to Rodriguez. Rodriguez also relayed the information about [REDACTED] and his address to the Respondent.

Rodriguez asserted that he prepared a UF-250 for [REDACTED]. The Respondent signed it, and Rodriguez put it in the wire basket at the 73 Precinct. He admitted that he did not record this in his memo book. He did not fill out a 250 for [REDACTED]. Rodriguez received a command discipline (CD) for failing "to put a proper entry in my memo book."

On January 7, 2006, Rodriguez was working with the same anti-crime team. Swystun was his partner. Rodriguez was in the vicinity of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] Streets. He explained that they would have been there regardless because of the high-crime nature of the area. However, they were also looking for [REDACTED]

Rodriguez testified that the team's vehicle was hit by airmail. They began "conducting verticals" in approximately three buildings to see where the debris was coming from. One of these was [REDACTED], although Rodriguez did not enter that particular one. They "entered through the front hatch" and "would scan the interior checking the roof and come back down

making sure that no one was in the building throwing debris at us.” They checked the stairways, halls, and rooftops of these buildings. Rodriguez agreed that the checks were “routine vertical patrols.” He had performed about 50 vertical patrols in his career. Rodriguez admitted that he did not radio in the patrols to central or observe any member of the team do so.

Rodriguez was not present for the arrest of [REDACTED] for two weapons; he was outside securing the RMP. He knew that the arrest took place on the first floor and that Anderson was the arresting officer. After [REDACTED]’s arrest, Rodriguez learned that [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] were the same person. At the precinct, Rodriguez observed that [REDACTED] had a “[REDACTED]” tattoo. [REDACTED] also mentioned [REDACTED] as a nickname during pedigree questioning. Rodriguez asserted that [REDACTED] was “probably the only Spanish guy in that neighborhood.”

On cross-examination, Rodriguez testified that it was common during drug stops for people to give officers information. He agreed that much of this information was “rumor and chatter.” It was the anti-crime team’s practice to interview or debrief every arrestee. Of the approximately 30 arrests he made, about 25 of the individuals “blurted out” information. Rodriguez clarified that they did not debrief all individuals stopped, only those that were arrested. Rodriguez had not signed up anyone as a CI this way, but “my partners may have arrested someone that they were getting credible knowledge from on the streets and they in turn signed him up.”

Rodriguez stated that to be signed up as a CI, the person had to have “a clear record, so they can’t be signed up right then and there.” They can be given a contact, interviewed later, and checked for criminal background.

Rodriguez testified that [REDACTED], in giving information about local drug dealers, mentioned one or two other names, but Rodriguez did not recall them. [REDACTED] gave less specific information about these supposed dealers than about [REDACTED].

In Rodriguez's anti-crime experience, [REDACTED] did not need to be registered as a CI because the team "didn't think that he was going to be an asset to the unit." They believed [REDACTED] was "just like a common stop, just being nervous that he just blurts out information." Rodriguez did not know if the information given by [REDACTED] was "truthful or reliable." The team would have been unable to use that information to obtain a search warrant because it was untested. If the team had obtained a warrant, they would have developed a tactical ("tac") plan "and you merge with [the Emergency Service Unit] and get a scheme of how the apartment is set up." He had never been involved in an arrest or attempted arrest where a CI was used but no warrant was obtained, for example, "something that was happening . . . in the street, not inside someone's home."

After the conversation with [REDACTED], but before January 7, 2006, Rodriguez was not instructed by the Respondent to perform any computer checks to discern [REDACTED]'s identity, or to check the address for drug activity. Rodriguez did not know if [REDACTED] told the [REDACTED] address to the Respondent, or whether Rodriguez himself mentioned it to the Respondent.

Rodriguez asserted that he did not produce a UF-250 for [REDACTED] because he never had any interaction with her, "never intervened with her," nor asked her questions. He contended that [REDACTED] was "free to go" and "just stood there on her own will." He denied stopping her.

Rodriguez testified that once the 250s are placed in the basket, someone from the administrative ("admin") office retrieves them. The basket was not sealed or locked. Rodriguez was "assuming" the forms are inputted into the computer and generated into a log. Rodriguez

did not get notified when the forms are put into the log. The 250 form was not a collection of carbon copies, but rather was a single two-sided form.

Rodriguez agreed that if the team was going to a specific location to recover firearms, they would have a tac plan. No one said they were going to [REDACTED] specifically to look for weapons or [REDACTED]. This location was not the first place they went on January 7, 2006. Rodriguez agreed that it was not "the goal or intent of the anti-crime team" to use the [REDACTED] information and go "directly to that residence to look for guns." He did not recall being "ordered" by Anderson to come to [REDACTED] Street because they were taking airmail.

Rodriguez had never worked in housing and had not performed vertical patrols "[a]s detailed as housing does . . . because of the building structures. . . . They have more trash room, stuff like that. We don't. Just skim pretty much." Rodriguez characterized the housing vertical patrols as general searches for criminal activity.

The [REDACTED] Street buildings were two or three stories tall with four dwellings each. Rodriguez agreed that their purpose in entering was not "to do a patrol of the building" or "clear the building of any criminal activity" but to find the source of the airmail. Rodriguez did not agree that he "ran" into the building, but "[m]aybe a jog." He did not perform "a full tactical check of the building." He denied that any members of the anti-crime team tried to enter [REDACTED]'s apartment through a rear window.

On re-direct examination, Rodriguez admitted that [REDACTED] was standing "by" [REDACTED] when Rodriguez said he found the joint.

On examination by the Court, Rodriguez was sure that the airmail had come from the roof. He went straight to the roof to find the airmailer.

Sergeant Michael King

King was assigned to IAB as an investigator. He had been a sergeant for almost five years and a member of the Department for a total of nine years. He investigated a complaint that the Respondent's anti-crime team had taken property from the complainant's residence during an arrest. King determined that there was no missing property, but found that the complainant's arresting officer, Police Officer Punch, failed to invoice his cell phone until two days after the arrest.

~~Department~~'s Exhibit 2 is the Property Clerk's Invoice, prepared by Punch. The date of arrest is listed as November 8, 2007, and the preparation of the voucher as November 10, 2007. It lists, as held for safekeeping, a cell phone and accessories, and the complainant's keys.

King's investigation revealed that the voucher was signed by the Respondent on, he believed, November 10, 2007. King testified that the voucher should have been signed "during the arrest" by the desk officer at the time of its preparation, although he agreed that any supervisor was permitted to sign on that line.

King testified that he interviewed the Respondent. When asked by the Advocate if the Respondent offered an explanation "as to why he would sign off on a voucher two days after it should have been prepared and vouchered," King answered, "I don't think he realized and he signed it based on P.O. Punch being a member" of the anti-crime team, and because the Respondent was present when the property was taken from the complainant.

King believed that Punch received a Schedule B Command Discipline for failing to voucher the property correctly. Punch received a penalty of 1 vacation day.

On cross-examination, King testified that the purpose of a supervisor's signature on the voucher was not to determine how the property was recovered, but just to confirm that the voucher matched the contents of the property envelope. King agreed that because the Respondent was present during the arrest, he was aware that the keys, cell phone and accessories were recovered.

Punch admitted to King that he had forgotten to voucher the complainant's property and "mistakenly" left it in his locker.

King determined in the course of his investigation that the Respondent's end of tour had been approaching. The Respondent told Punch to fill out the invoice and "voucher it with the desk sergeant." During the Respondent's next tour, two days later, he learned that Punch did not follow these instructions. He then re-instructed Punch to complete the invoice and voucher the property.

#### The Respondent's Case

The Respondent called Sergeant Kirk Anderson as a witness, and testified on his own behalf.

#### Sergeant Kirk Anderson

Anderson was assigned to Transit District 33. Before he became a sergeant, Anderson worked in an anti-crime team with the Respondent for about three years from 2004 to 2006, primarily in the 73 Precinct. Anderson had been involved with about 100 arrests with the team. Rodriguez, Swystun and Dobles were the other officers on the team.

Anderson was not present for the initial stop of [REDACTED]. He was in a vehicle with the Respondent, and responded to the stop after, he believed, Rodriguez contacted them. When they arrived, Anderson observed the Respondent speak to [REDACTED]. The Respondent told Anderson that [REDACTED] said "there was a couple of spots," Anderson believed, on and in the vicinity of [REDACTED] Street. Anderson characterized what the Respondent said as "[n]othing too specific."

Anderson testified that it was not unusual for the Respondent to speak to individuals that had been stopped to get information because "that's what we did." This was different from when the team signed up CIs. Anderson described a CI as "usually someone who had hard evidence . . . something that would get us a search warrant." The team would have such individuals come to the command on a later date, "where we can talk to them and get some concrete evidence which requires them to actually enter a location and know not just what's in there, but its whereabouts and who[ 's] responsible for it." If the team believed "what he is saying is prudent," they would seek a warrant.

In Anderson's anti-crime experience, [REDACTED] would not be used as a CI. Anderson stated that "in stops like that," individuals "usually" gave information, but "[n]othing really concrete." Anderson considered this to be "source of information that we use in the street, usually just pretty much sound bites of what somebody was saying. Absolutely no clarification whether it was true or false. Usually we just took it as they were pointing us in a direction and we would take it from there." This would not lead to "direct enforcement action such as going to residences, getting warrants, that type of stuff."

Anderson testified that following the [REDACTED] stop, the Respondent did not order an investigation of anyone named [REDACTED]. Anderson denied that there was a tac plan or "specific design" by the Respondent to go to [REDACTED]'s apartment.

Anderson indicated that he was in the area of [REDACTED] Street the next day. He was working with Swystun. The Respondent had contacted Anderson and told him to come to the intersection of [REDACTED] Street and Howard Avenue. Anderson did not know if the Respondent told him during this call why he needed him, but the Respondent did tell Anderson why when he arrived. There were rocks being thrown at the Respondent's vehicle. The entire team was there. They split up to see who was throwing the rocks. They began "entering going up and down" three or four buildings on the street. Anderson personally entered three buildings, one of which was [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Street. The buildings were walk-ups.

Anderson never worked in the Housing Bureau but had participated in "tactical vertical searches" of NYCHA buildings when PSA 2 needed 73 Precinct sectors to respond. He described the "actual vertical" patrol as being "usually for a housing project where you would go up to the top floor . . . and do a floor by floor search from the top down to the bottom, by the stairs, checking at each stairwell at each floor."

Anderson stated that the searches he performed in the [REDACTED] Street area were not vertical patrols "by project standards." They entered the building and went to the top, but did not perform "the systematic floor by floor look that you would do in an actual 10-75 vertical."<sup>2</sup> Anderson agreed that they were "looking for a specific criminal committing a specific crime," rather than "patrolling the buildings themselves."

Anderson testified that when he entered [REDACTED], he did not know that [REDACTED] lived there. Anderson did not go in with the intent of acting on the [REDACTED] information.

When Anderson went into [REDACTED], he immediately sensed an "overwhelming" marijuana odor. A man he later learned to be [REDACTED] was in the lobby. [REDACTED] was in front of a partially-open apartment door. The door "opens up" as Anderson approached [REDACTED].

<sup>2</sup> I.e., the radio code for a vertical patrol, see form PD 112-090-A, Radio Code Signals Card.

Before the person who opened it could close it again, Anderson identified himself as a police officer and “told everybody to hold up what they are doing.” The person behind the door asked Anderson to lower his voice “and just invited” him into the apartment. He later learned this person to be [REDACTED].

Anderson asked [REDACTED] “if there is anything in the apartment I need to know about” for safety reasons. Anderson testified that he asked about weapons but asserted that his main concern was whether there were other individuals in the apartment. [REDACTED] said that he had two unloaded firearms, which were locked up but did not belong to him. Anderson also found out that there were two sleeping children in the back of the apartment.

Anderson entered the apartment, and the Respondent arrived. He was unsure if he contacted the Respondent to respond to the apartment. Anderson testified that he and the Respondent instructed Swystun to go to the rear of the building “in case anything went out the windows.” To his knowledge, no one from the anti-crime team tried to enter the apartment this way.

At this point, Anderson testified, the Respondent took over the questioning. The guns were recovered, unloaded, from inside a safe. Anderson denied threatening [REDACTED], his wife or [REDACTED] if they refused to turn over the weapons.

Anderson learned from the Respondent that [REDACTED] was also known as [REDACTED]. He believed, but was not sure, that this information “came from [REDACTED]” because that was what the Respondent told him. Anderson then testified that this information came out during pedigree questioning at the precinct, or from the Respondent at the scene. [REDACTED] also had a “[REDACTED] tattoo on his forearm. Anderson believed he observed the tattoo while still in the apartment because [REDACTED] was wearing a short-sleeve shirt.

On cross-examination, Anderson stated that the team did not often "debrief" persons stopped, but not arrested, on the street. By this term, Anderson meant where the officer generally asks the questions. Anderson testified that persons arrested by the anti-crime team are debriefed to get information about criminal activity. Some of this information would be acted upon.

Anderson said, however, "You don't want to seem like you are interrogating somebody on a stop." Anderson stated that the team could "[d]evelop a rapport with someone on the street, engage them in conversation." He asserted that it was common for stopped individuals to offer unsolicited information about criminal activity.

Anderson agreed that if the anti-crime team was thinking about getting a warrant, the Respondent usually would perform the database checks.

Anderson stated that it took him two to five minutes to arrive at [REDACTED] Street after being contacted by the Respondent. By then, the airmail had ended. Anderson believed [REDACTED] was the last building he entered.

Anderson admitted that he was not sure if it was before or after he knew firearms were present in [REDACTED]'s apartment that Swystun was instructed to go to the rear.

Anderson testified that at some point during the arrest processing, he and the Respondent were referring to [REDACTED] as [REDACTED].

Anderson explained that as a sergeant in the Transit Bureau, he assigned his officers at roll call to perform directed patrols. This entailed officers entering train stations and checking the platform and mezzanine areas. The purpose was the same as a vertical patrol. When these patrols were assigned, they were to be put over the air as a 10-75 directed patrol (i.e., 10-75 D).

Anderson generally gave the officers a time to radio in the patrols, and he would meet them there. These patrols counted as activity for the officers.

The Court asked Anderson whether the Respondent was "surprised" to hear that [REDACTED] had the two guns, or if this information "just seemed routine." Anderson answered, "I have to tell you a lot of this was just routine for us. We go through the same motions time and time again. No, there was no surprise."

Anderson stated that when he did vertical patrols in NYCHA buildings, there was not necessarily a pre-action meeting where his supervisor said which building Anderson and his partner were to patrol. He and his partner had performed vertical patrols without a supervisor's instruction. For example, if a shooting took place and the perpetrator ran into a building, they would do a vertical patrol.

Anderson testified that he had performed vertical patrols without radioing the dispatcher. If the patrol was not radioed in, a separate job number would not be generated. In the shooting example, the vertical patrol would be "tied to the original job," i.e., responding to the shooting.

#### The Respondent

The Respondent had been a member of the Department for thirteen years, and a sergeant for nearly seven. He had been the anti-crime supervisor in the 73 Precinct, and at the time of trial was a patrol supervisor there on the 4x12 platoon. He was also in anti-crime while a police officer in the 66 Precinct.

The Respondent testified that anti-crime did use CIs. The Respondent himself had registered two CIs, but also had been involved in several scenarios where CIs were signed up. The person had to be "credible," meaning that he must have a "clear" criminal record and be a

"citizen in good standing." The information must be credible as well: "It can't just be somebody knows somebody about something somewhere." To determine credibility of the information, the Respondent would check with other officers in the precinct, or look at arrest logs "to see if information that's given to me would coincide with that." If the information is about something that just happened, like a shooting the previous night, "that would be firsthand information given on something that we know is accurate."

The Respondent agreed that anti-crime received information "from non-registered confidential informants." For example, if the anti-crime team responded to a job and someone offered information regarding that incident, "that could be considered information given and used." They could also receive information about "general crime in the area." If someone was arrested and debriefed, the team would listen "to any information that that person might have in regards to their specific case or any other case that they may or may not have been involved with." Such persons would not be registered as CIs because they had been arrested on "their own charges."

The Respondent testified that on January 6, 2006, he responded to a location near [REDACTED] Street. He was familiar with that area. The Respondent believed he arrived late that night, and "would be guessing," but thought it was before midnight. Rodriguez, one of his officers, was speaking to [REDACTED] and "another female." The Respondent did not speak to the female and asserted that to his knowledge, she was not detained.

Rodriguez told the Respondent that he believed he saw [REDACTED] smoking a marijuana cigarette, and then throwing it. [REDACTED] seemed to know the Respondent from a prior arrest of an acquaintance of [REDACTED]. They "engaged in conversation based on that." [REDACTED] mentioned his pregnant girlfriend and her drug habit. In fact, [REDACTED] himself seemed impaired by drugs. The

Respondent and [REDACTED] spoke for 20 to 30 minutes. The Respondent estimated [REDACTED] to be around 16 years old.

[REDACTED] also told the Respondent about possible criminal activity on his block, mentioning several names and buildings. The Respondent believed [REDACTED] mentioned his own address, which the Respondent believed was on [REDACTED] Street. The Respondent asked where he obtained his marijuana, and he said he got it from an individual on his block. He mentioned the name [REDACTED] as a source, and said that [REDACTED] might have weapons "on him or with him." [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] lived on [REDACTED] Street but was not more specific. [REDACTED] also discussed, regarding "something similar to the arrest that he mentioned," the name of an individual, either [REDACTED], that might have possessed guns.

The Respondent testified that he wanted to refer [REDACTED] to programs that might be able to assist his girlfriend with regard to her drug problem. The Respondent also thought about programs like crime stoppers and gun stoppers that [REDACTED] might be interested in. They exchanged phone numbers, with the Respondent telling [REDACTED] to be in touch "if he needed any help in regards to that or anything else he wanted to tell me." The Respondent did not have a Department cell phone and gave [REDACTED] his personal cell number.

The Respondent would not characterize himself as "interested" in registering [REDACTED] as a CI, but wanted to listen to what he had to say. The Respondent believed that he looked into the prior arrest [REDACTED] was talking about, but did not investigate the [REDACTED] remark. That information was not specific enough for the Respondent to follow up, but he "cataloged it in [his] head."

The Respondent believed [REDACTED] called him shortly after he was released. [REDACTED] said "he will be around tomorrow if [the Respondent] can give him a call or he will call [the

Respondent].” The Respondent believed [REDACTED] tried calling him again but did not get through. The Respondent called back a few times and he did not get through. The Respondent asserted that “there was really no conversation.”

The Respondent testified that if an officer is required to fill out a UF-250 and does not do so on his own, the Respondent would instruct him to do it. He generally signed 250s at the end of tour, and his practice was always to ask. The Respondent did not specifically recall signing a 250 for the [REDACTED] stop, but was “sure one was done” and that Rodriguez “would have” filled out a 250.

The Respondent testified that once the 250s are placed in the basket at the command desk, they are taken by personnel to the crime analysis office, where the 250s are inputted into the “system”. The Respondent did not get notified when 250s filled out by his officers were inputted.

The Respondent was working again on January 7, 2006. The anti-crime team did not go out to patrol any specific location. Later on in the tour, around 10:30 or 11:00 p.m., [REDACTED] called the Respondent and said that there was an elderly black male on [REDACTED] Street wearing a waist pack with an illegal firearm inside. The Respondent did not recall if [REDACTED] gave an exact address.

The Respondent testified that the team responded to [REDACTED] Street after the Respondent spoke to [REDACTED]. The Respondent believed he was working with Dobles. The Respondent did not observe anyone fitting the description, but he soon “started receiving some debris from the building tops.” He contacted the other team members and they began looking for the persons responsible by “going in the buildings,” up to the roof, to see if there was anyone up there. Different members of the team went into different buildings, but no one went in alone.

The Respondent understood the term “vertical patrol,” as described in Patrol Guide procedure 212-59, to mean a predetermined time and location where officers, two or more together, were designated by a supervisor to perform a “systematic” floor-by-floor search of a building, stopping to take police action if necessary. This was “other than what other assignment your patrol duty is that day.” The Respondent had done vertical patrols before as an anti-crime sergeant and would radio the dispatcher to so advise. He did these patrols because of “ongoing criminal activity,” like noise complaints coming in over the course of a night due to “kids running in the hallway.” The anti-crime team would not be looking for a specific child. By doing this, the Respondent would be taking himself off routine patrol.

The Respondent testified that when he entered the [REDACTED] Street buildings, these were not vertical patrols, noting that they “received the airmail” and “went into the buildings looking for person responsible for that.” He stated that the term “vertical, it’s loosely thrown out there. I guess it’s just a way we communicate with each other so we can understand each other.” The Respondent agreed that at [REDACTED] Street, the team was looking for “a person who was actually committing a crime at the moment,” as opposed to “any type of crime that may be in the building.” He added that “given the circumstances of where we were, we just went into the buildings in pursuit of who we thought may have been responsible.”

The Respondent testified that Anderson notified him that he had stopped an individual. The Respondent came to that location. Anderson said that a person, later determined to be named [REDACTED], “wanted him to come inside the house because he had stopped somebody in the hallway.” Anderson asked [REDACTED] if “there was anything in there he shouldn’t have or could possibly be a threat.” [REDACTED] said he had two firearms inside. The Respondent instructed Anderson to recover the firearms, and [REDACTED] was arrested.

Before that point, the Respondent testified, he did not have a “predetermined plan” to focus on that location. He did not go there based on [REDACTED]’ information. Before Anderson told him about the firearms, he had no “reason to suspect” that [REDACTED] was the [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] had mentioned the night before. While at the location, the person Anderson had originally stopped [REDACTED] – referred to [REDACTED]. “That’s when I made the connection.”

The Respondent testified that Punch had arrested an individual named [REDACTED] in, the Respondent believed, the late hours of November 8, 2007. Punch was supposed to voucher [REDACTED]’ personal property for safekeeping on that date. The arrest occurred toward the end of both the Respondent’s and Punch’s tours. The Respondent said that he checked Punch’s arrest paperwork “and everything else, and the arrest evidence to be vouchered,” staying at the command about an hour after his scheduled end of tour. The Respondent then went end of tour and instructed Punch on “vouchering and completing the remaining forms.” The end of tour was actually in the early morning hours of November 9, 2007.

Punch told the Respondent at the outset of the next tour they worked together, November 10, 2007, that he forgot to voucher some of [REDACTED] property. The Respondent re-instructed Punch to voucher the property. The Respondent then signed the property voucher (DX 2). The Respondent or officers under his supervision delivered the receipt copy to [REDACTED] who had already been released, at his residence.

The Respondent stated that the purpose of a supervisor’s signature on the property clerk’s invoice was for “accuracy and completeness.”

On cross-examination, when asked to explain the several calls he made to [REDACTED] on January 7, 2006, between 1919 and 2120 hours, the Respondent answered, “I can only assume it’s because I didn’t speak to him.” Some of the records indicated a missed or dropped call.

The Respondent admitted that [REDACTED] was reliable to the extent of recognizing him from a prior incident.

The Respondent indicated that he entered [REDACTED] to look for the airmailers, but stopped when he smelled marijuana.

On examination by the Court, the Respondent stated that he was not interested in using [REDACTED] "for my own purposes."

#### FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

The specifications will be discussed out of numerical order to preserve the chronology of the events in this case.

#### Disciplinary Case No. 83041/07

##### Specification No. 1

The Respondent is charged with failing to ensure that UF-250 Stop, Question and Frisk Report Worksheets were filed for the stops of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. Corletto, the IAB investigator, stated that the 73 Precinct computer log for 250s had no record of the [REDACTED] or [REDACTED] forms. He did not examine any paper records to see if, for example, the [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] 250s existed where they should have been chronologically. Rodriguez, the police officer who made these stops, recalled filling out a 250 for [REDACTED] and placing it in the wire desk basket at the 73 Precinct. He admitted, however, that he did not record this activity in his memo book. Rodriguez took a CD for not putting the activity in his memo book. The Respondent did not remember if he signed the [REDACTED] 250 as the team supervisor, but "was sure one was done" because Rodriguez either would have done so, or would have been instructed to do so.

The Court finds the Respondent Guilty. Rodriguez's insistence that he remembered filling out the 250 nearly four years prior bears little weight in light of the facts that he failed to note this in his memo book and that his command had no record of it. The Respondent's certainty that the correct procedure was followed is similarly unpersuasive. Notably, no data-keeping problem at the 73 Precinct prevented Corletto from concluding that another officer, Anderson, completed a 250 for the stop of [REDACTED] the next night.

Furthermore, the Court rejects the argument that the Respondent cannot be found Guilty of failing to ensure that a Stop, Question and Frisk Report Worksheet was filed for [REDACTED] because [REDACTED] was not actually stopped. The witnesses were asked what happened at the outset of the incident. Rodriguez was asked, "On the night of January 6, 2006, did you stop two individuals named [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]?", and he responded, "Yes, I did." The Respondent testified that when he arrived on the scene, Rodriguez was speaking to [REDACTED] and a female. Rodriguez stated that he approached the "pedestrians" because [REDACTED] appeared to be smoking a marijuana cigarette. His testimony indicates that he anticipated stopping both [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. As the encounter developed, it turned out that only [REDACTED] might have engaged in criminal activity, while [REDACTED] was a bystander. That development did not abrogate Rodriguez's responsibility to fill out a 250 for both individuals that he stopped. The witnesses' later equivocation when asked specifically by the Respondent's counsel whether [REDACTED] was actually stopped is not persuasive in light of their earlier answers.

The Court notes that the Respondent had [REDACTED] phone number, as he called it three times on January 7, 2006. This indicates that [REDACTED] was detained long enough for the Respondent to obtain her number directly. Or, it indicates that [REDACTED]'s detention was long or involved enough that the Respondent decided to obtain her number.

Because it was the Respondent's duty as supervisor to ensure that the 250s were filed, he is found Guilty of the first specification of the first case.

Specification No. 4

The Department's case was predicated on the theory that the Respondent and his 73 Precinct anti-crime team used [REDACTED] as a confidential informant to make the arrest of [REDACTED] [REDACTED]. The fourth specification charges the Respondent with failing to register [REDACTED] as a CI before "utilizing" him. The Court finds the Respondent Not Guilty.

The Respondent and Rodriguez testified that during the stop, question and frisk of [REDACTED] he spontaneously began telling the officers about criminal activity he knew of in his neighborhood. [REDACTED] mentioned the name [REDACTED]; only Rodriguez specifically recalled that the [REDACTED] address was also referenced by [REDACTED] with regard to [REDACTED]. The Respondent admitted that he and [REDACTED] exchanged phone numbers but said it was because he wanted to be able to assist [REDACTED], whom the Respondent could have referred to other agencies or programs.

The Respondent's witnesses testified that the arrest of [REDACTED] occurred after [REDACTED] called the Respondent on January 7, 2006, and told him that there was a man on the street with a gun. When the anti-crime officers arrived, they began receiving "airmail," i.e., someone began throwing debris at them from above. They entered the nearby buildings, and Anderson smelled marijuana coming from one of the apartments in [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] was in the apartment and told Anderson he was in possession of two firearms. [REDACTED] was then arrested.

The information given during the stop was not of the kind that required registration of [REDACTED] as a CI, as opposed to the kind of information that members come across on a regular

basis, whether on anti-crime duties or regular patrol. Interim Order 23 of 2006, although promulgated after the incident in the present case, provides a useful definition of terms. It states that a confidential informant is someone that “provides useful and credible information” regarding criminal activity. Anderson, one of the police officers on the anti-crime team but a sergeant at the time of trial, provided a cogent explanation of what “reliable” means in the CI context. He testified that a CI was “usually someone who had hard evidence . . . something that would get us a search warrant.” A putative CI had to “get some concrete evidence,” which meant that he had to “actually enter a location and know not just what’s in there, but its whereabouts and who[’s] responsible for it.”

The information given by [REDACTED] did not reach this threshold. There is no evidence that the Respondent had more information from [REDACTED] than the following: there was a person named [REDACTED] who lived at [REDACTED] and had two weapons in his apartment. This did not include the actual apartment in which [REDACTED] resided, and where in that apartment the guns were located. Nor was there an indication of whether the information was first-hand knowledge: did [REDACTED] observe these guns in [REDACTED]’s home, or did someone tell [REDACTED] they were there? Finally, there was no indication of when [REDACTED] gained this knowledge, and how current the information was. The Court notes that while [REDACTED] did not testify, he was interviewed by Corletto, the IAB investigator. Corletto did not testify that [REDACTED] told him he gave more details to the Respondent.

Further, the Department’s case lacked proof of a nexus between the information given by [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]’s arrest. There was no evidence that [REDACTED]’s arrest happened in a manner other than the way the Respondent’s witnesses described. There were 21 telephone calls among the Respondent, and [REDACTED], between 0113 and 2120 hours on January 7, 2006 (see

DX 1). The Respondent asserted that these calls were made because [REDACTED] was trying to contact him. The Court notes that the first call was from [REDACTED] to the Respondent. But even if the Respondent was interested in gaining further information from [REDACTED], the Department did not present any proof that the Respondent obtained the kind of reliable, verifiable information that would warrant the registration of [REDACTED] as a CI. As such, the Respondent is found Not Guilty of Specification 4.

Specification Nos. 2 & 3

The witnesses testified that the members of the 73 Precinct anti-crime team headed by the Respondent entered several buildings on [REDACTED] Street after receiving airmail. The Respondent is charged in Specification 2 with failing to radio the dispatcher that the team was conducting “vertical patrols,” as required by Patrol Guide procedure 212-59 (5) (uniformed member is required to “[t]ransmit radio code signal ‘10-75 V’ to radio dispatcher”).

The Respondent is found Not Guilty because the actions of the anti-crime team did not constitute vertical patrols as defined by the specified Patrol Guide procedure, 212-59, notwithstanding the phrasing used by the officers at trial or during the investigatory official interviews. The reason for vertical patrols is to target “illegal activity occurring in public areas of multiple occupancy buildings.” The term itself is defined as “the tactically planned patrol of the interior hallways, stairways, and rooftops of selected multiple occupancy buildings.” Vertical patrols are a “valuable problem solving tool, as well as an important component of the department’s drug control strategy.” A vertical patrol contemplates that there are “past incidents at a location” which “indicate vertical patrol would be useful.” Community members and landlords (if private property) are to be consulted. The commanding officer of the command in

question is to maintain lists of possible vertical patrol locations, including the “[n]ature of problem(s) or condition(s),” and “[t]imes when illegal activity is prevalent.” Scheduling of vertical patrols is to be based upon “when the subject conditions are prevalent.”

The foregoing demonstrates that the Respondent’s actions, and that of the other anti-crime officers, were not “vertical patrols” within the meaning of Patrol Guide procedure 212-59. Vertical patrols are tactically-planned entries designed to respond to ongoing conditions, like young people running in the hallways and creating noise, or individuals selling drugs in the lobby or stairwells. Here, the officers initiated police action in response to a specific offense and in pursuit of a specific offender or offenders – throwing debris at the officers on the ground. They went “vertically” up to the roofs of the buildings, but they were not tactically and systematically patrolling them in response to conditions. This was not the kind of task that required a separate job assignment, the 10-75 V, from the Respondent’s normal assignment for that tour, anti-crime patrol. As such, the Respondent was not required to radio in any vertical patrols, as required by Patrol Guide procedure 212-59 (5). Thus, the Court finds him Not Guilty of Specification 2.

The Court also finds the Respondent Not Guilty of Specification 3. The specification references only Patrol Guide Procedure 212-59 (11). This requires the member to “[m]ake **ACTIVITY LOG (PD112-145)** entry of results of vertical patrol.” Corletto testified that there were no memo book entries about the vertical patrols. The Respondent testified that he did not make memo book entries about the elderly man with the waist pack or receiving airmail, but that he was required to make notations about authorizing the arrest of [REDACTED].

The Court makes no comment here about the adequacy of the Respondent’s memo book entries. He is not charged, however, with a general failure to make the proper notations. Rather,

he is charged solely and specifically with failing to make entries "of results of vertical patrol," as required under Patrol Guide procedure 212-59 (11). Because no vertical patrols took place, the Respondent is found Not Guilty of Specification 3.

Disciplinary Case No. 85211/09

Specification No. 1

In this specification, the Respondent is charged with failing to ensure that a police officer under his supervision vouchered the property of a prisoner in a timely manner. The Respondent and King, the IAB investigator, gave similar accounts. Punch, the arresting officer, recovered keys, a cell phone and phone accessories from the arrestee, [REDACTED] late on November 8, 2007. The scheduled tours of both Punch and the Respondent were ending in the early hours of November 9, 2007. When the Respondent went end of tour, he instructed Punch on the proper vouchering of the property. Punch did not voucher the property on the tour of the arrest; he kept it in his locker until the tour of November 10, 2007, when he told the Respondent of his error. Punch vouchered the property at that time and the Respondent signed the invoice.

The Court finds the Respondent Not Guilty. The Respondent's tour was over. He gave Punch specific instructions on what to do with the property, and Punch disregarded those instructions. This case is thus distinguishable from those where supervisors fail to instruct subordinates on proper procedure. See Case No. 81251/05, signed Mar. 24, 2008 (sergeant was found guilty of failure to supervise where he did not instruct police officer to enter dwelling in order to secure it as part of crime scene; property was subsequently stolen from the location).

PENALTY

In order to determine an appropriate penalty, the Respondent's service record was examined. See Matter of Pell v. Board of Education, 34 N.Y.2d 222, 240 (1974). The Respondent was appointed to the Department on April 15, 1997. Information from his personnel folder that was considered in making this penalty recommendation is contained in the attached confidential memorandum.

The Respondent has been found Guilty of failing to ensure that UF-250 Stop, Question and Frisk Report Worksheets were prepared for two individuals that his anti-crime team stopped. The Court notes that it was not disputed that the stop in question was itself legal and appropriate. In light of the Respondent's supervisory position, and taking into account his good record, the Court recommends a penalty of 5 vacation days. Cf. Case Nos. 80029/04 & 80030/04, signed Mar. 21, 2005 (eighteen-year sergeant with no prior disciplinary record forfeits five vacation days for failing to prepare a UF-250, neglecting to make a command log entry of a strip search, and abusing his authority by supervising the unlawful search of two other individuals).

Respectfully submitted,



David S. Weisel  
Assistant Deputy Commissioner Trials



POLICE DEPARTMENT  
CITY OF NEW YORK

From: Assistant Deputy Commissioner Trials

To: Police Commissioner

Subject: CONFIDENTIAL MEMORANDUM  
SERGEANT THOMAS LENT  
TAX REGISTRY NO. 919291  
DISCIPLINARY CASE NOS. 83041/07 & 85211/09

In 2007 and 2008, the Respondent received an overall rating of 4.0 "Highly Competent" on his annual performance evaluation. In 2006, he was rated 4.5 "Extremely Competent/Highly Competent." The Respondent has been awarded 42 medals for Excellent Police Duty and 15 medals for Meritorious Police Duty. In his 13 years of service, [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] He has no prior formal disciplinary record.

For your consideration.



David S. Weisel  
Assistant Deputy Commissioner – Trials